

BACONIANA.

VOL. XI. *Third Series.* OCTOBER, 1913. No. 44.

"THE BACONIAN HERESY."

(Concluded.)

THE space available in BACONIANA is not sufficient to accommodate exposure of the hollowness of the arguments of Mr. J. M. Robertson. In this concluding article on the subject attention can only be drawn to some of the misstatements contained in "The Baconian Heresy."

The following remarks are calculated to warn the reader from placing reliance on the assertions found in it. A few examples will suffice :—

"Puttenham, who had been educated abroad" (p. 307). There is no evidence to show that any Puttenham was educated abroad. This is a statement made by Mr. Robertson solely on his own authority. He does not even know who Puttenham was! or that he wrote the "Arte of English Poesy"!

Mr. Robertson's dates are frequently untrustworthy. He attributes (p. 317) Patericke's translation of Gentillet on Machiavelli to the year 1577. The first edition was printed by Adam Islip in 1602, twenty-five years after the date given! It is a very remarkable work dedicated to Francis Hastings and Edward Bacon. By

whom? Although it purports to be a translation, the original does not appear to be in existence.

It is said "questions of word values and word forms could hardly miss being debated at times among the company at the Mermaid, to say nothing of the green-room" (p. 255). "He must have heard at the Mermaid some mention of the scientific and other speculations of his day" (p. 477). Mr. Robertson knows that there is not a particle of evidence justifying the belief that Shagspere was a member of the Mermaid Company or in any way connected with it. The suggestion that the professional actors of the Elizabethan period *could* discuss word forms or word values is too ridiculous to be entertained.

Mr. Robertson writes (p. 444): "The State paper in question is not and could not have been by Bacon, who in 1584 was in no position to offer State counsel to Queen Elizabeth. It figures for historical students as Lord Burleigh's advice to Queen Elizabeth ("Harl. Misc.," 2nd Ed., II., 277). Did Lord Burleigh, then, write Shakespeare?" Perhaps there could be no better illustration of how with Mr. Robertson "inconsequence follows inconsequence." Mr. Spedding takes a different view ("Life and Letters," Vol. I., pp. 45, 46), for he writes:—

"I have taken some pains to ascertain whether this tract was ever ascribed to Burghley, in his own time or near it. But I find no such thing. This Harleian M.S. (which is probably the original transcript or a contemporary copy) is anonymous. . . . External evidence therefore for ascribing the tract to Burghley there is, in my judgment, none at all; and when I turn to consider the internal evidence, I find it impossible to believe that he had anything to do with it. It is evidently the production of some young unauthorised adviser, who feels it necessary to offer an apology for volunteering his advice." . . . "Now if Burghley's claim is set aside, Bacon's may seem (on the strength of Tenison's list (1679), and of the fact that this paper

had somehow got mixed up with his writings—a fact to which the contents of the volume of 1651 bear witness) to stand next. And though I am far from thinking the evidence conclusive, yet I do think it sufficient to justify the insertion of this paper here as being *possibly and not improbably* his composition. Certainly the tone and manner of it suits his relation to the Queen perfectly well; and we know that not many years after she used to encourage him to deliver his mind on such matters."

Now let the reader judge fairly of Mr. Robertson's method of controversy. The "letter of advice" was attributed to Bacon by Spedding, and with the foregoing explanation printed in the "Life and Letters" by him. Mr. Robertson knows this, and yet because Dr. Theobald accepts Spedding's opinion, relying on the reader not being aware of the facts, he seeks to misrepresent the position and discredit Dr. Theobald by asking, "Did Lord Burleigh, then, write Shakespeare?"

How utterly Mr. Robertson has failed to grasp the basis of the Baconian theory is made evident from the following misstatements: "Supposing the literary world and the neighbours to have known *and appreciated* the plays, and yet to have regarded Shakespeare as a man of no account (and this appears to be the point of the argument before us), we are to infer that it was in Shakespeare's day a matter of common notoriety that the plays were the work of someone else, presumptively the Lord Chancellor, Viscount of St. Albans." It may be pointed out that as Shagspere died in 1616, and Bacon was not made Lord Chancellor until 1619, the unity of time has not been preserved in this suggestion. Further, that the Lord Chancellor never was Viscount of St. Albans, nor even Viscount St. Albans. If Mr. Robertson is to be taken seriously, it is obvious that he knows nothing about the educational condition of the people of Stratford in that period. It is ridiculous to suggest that they could appreciate the plays. It is highly improbable that they had ever heard of them.

But this need not be laboured, for Mr. Robertson destroys his own argument. On page 28 he writes :—

"There is not the slightest reason to suppose that the average inhabitants of Stratford did or could appreciate the plays as literature, all questions of authorship apart."

And so he blows hot and cold.

There is not a scrap of evidence that during his lifetime Shagspere was regarded as a man of any literary or intellectual account, or of any account except as a well-to-do resident (probably maltster) of Stratford. There is no evidence that the literary world ever saw him or recognised him as an author, an actor-manager, or even as an actor. There are many points upon which Baconians are not agreed, but there is complete unanimity on this—that it was in Shakespeare's day *not* "a matter of notoriety that the plays were the work" of him who subsequently became Lord Chancellor. Dr. Ingleby's testimony may be again quoted, and it entirely destroys this argument of Mr. Robertson's and three-fifths of his others : "It is clear that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of his time." If the Stratford monument was erected in 1623, the literary world would never see it or know anything about it, and very few of the neighbours could read the inscription, and those who could would probably wonder how such terms could be applied to the countryman they had known as Shagspere. The inscription on it is altogether inapplicable to the Shakespeare Mr. Robertson describes. There is no mention of his being actor, poet or dramatist ! Bacon's cousin, Sir Anthony Cook, when he walked down from his house to see the new monument on the church, might wonder who put it there and placed upon it such an apparently inappropriate inscription, but Bacon's intimate friend, George Carew, probably did not wonder. His influence in Stratford was paramount. "Was it,"

asks Mr. Robertson, "a universal conspiracy or a twice enacted mystification?" (p. 17). It was not a universal conspiracy. There is no necessity to attribute the knowledge of the facts to more than two or three people. It was a mystification twice and many more times enacted. Bacon was not seriously at fault in his calculations when he left his fame "to his own country after some ages had passed." But he had faith in a more rapid evolution of sound reasoning powers than has obtained. He believed his principles of inductive reasoning would be applied more speedily. He knew it would take time, but he never believed that it would be possible for a man possessing such intellectual capacities as Mr. Robertson possesses to be so rooted in prejudice and convention as to refuse to admit the consideration of an hypothesis because it had not been previously propounded. Jonson's words in his comment in reference to Bacon may be applied. "Nothing is more ridiculous than to make an author a dictator, as 'Mr. Robertson' has made 'Spedding.' The damage is infinite, knowledge receives by it. Let 'Spedding' and others have their dues; but if we can make farther Discoveries of truth and fitness than they, why are we envied?"

It is stated that, unfortunately, Baconians "do not acquire the information that is relevant to this discussion" (p. 18). The *tu quoque* retort would be applicable. Mr. Robertson loftily informs his readers that biography was not the usage of the time. There were positively no newspapers to deal with such matters as the death of Shagspere. But he omitted to say that it was an age of writing of London letters to people in the country, and that such letters have come down to these times in considerable quantities. In them there will be found reference to society scandals, to literary matters, to political affairs, to everything which is to-day treated

of in the newspapers, but not one reference direct or indirect—not one reference is to be found which even Mr. Robertson's ingenuity could distort into a reference to the Stratford Shagspere or to the plays and poems of Shakespeare. "It is clear that the bard of our admiration was unknown to the men of his time." This, the testimony of *the* authority on the subject, Dr. Ingleby, Mr. Robertson has the assurance to characterize as "the extreme Baconian explanation" (p. 27).

"It is quite possible that Bacon had heard performances of the plays cited and echoed them" (p. 458). Thus, when the eminent controversialist gets uncomfortably cornered, does he seek to make a way out. Of course it *is* quite possible, but it is curious to see how careful Mr. Robertson is to keep Bacon away from the theatre. He says (p. 532): "It does not follow that before his official advancement he had not from time to time seen a play and carried away with him a line or two; but he was verily no haunter of theatres." Heard performances of the plays cited and echoed them! Before his official advancement from time to time seen a play and carried away a line or two! If men of culture did not go to the public theatres it was because such plays as those of Shakespeare were not performed at them. The more Mr. Robertson's arguments are examined the more insufficient they appear.

Mr. Robertson endeavours to convey to the reader that Bacon disparaged the stage (p. 531). The reader is referred to the opinions on it which Bacon expresses in his signed works.* If Mr. Robertson knows anything about the plays which were enacted at Elizabethan theatres, he must know that they were with few exceptions without literary merit, for the most part obscene, and that Bacon was right when he said that the stage is capable of no small influence both in discipline and

* See "The Mystery of Francis Bacon," pp. 177-186.

corruption. Now, of corruptions of this kind we have enough, but the discipline has in our times been plainly neglected. There was no "crying stinking fish" (p. 532). It was a perfectly accurate criticism of the Elizabethan theatres.

"And with all this it is the more wildly incredible that he should have been the greatest master of verse as well as the chief master of philosophic prose in his age. Monstrous as it is, the thesis that he taking all *knowledge* as his province, and tied by destiny to the vocations of law and politics, yet secretly supplied during twenty years of his crowded life, the main stock of the new plays of a London theatre, and penned *Venus and Adonis*, *Lucrece* and *The Sonnets*—monstrous in every respect as is that fantasy, it is hardly more incredible at bottom than would be, for those who can realise the conditions of artistic genius, the conception of the combination in one man of a faculty not far short of supreme for prose, and for prose themes with a quite supreme faculty for impassioned verse."

That is the opinion expressed by the controversialist, but it is in direct opposition to opinions expressed by some of the greatest poets and literary men.

First let James Spedding speak :

"The truth is that Bacon was not without the fine frenzy of the poet. . . . Had his genius taken the ordinary direction, I have little doubt that it would have carried him to a place among the great poets."

Shelley wrote :

"Lord Bacon was a poet. His language has a sweet and majestic rhythm that satisfies the sense no less than the almost superhuman wisdom of his philosophy satisfies the intellect. It is a strain which distends, and then bursts the circumference of the reader's mind, and pours itself forth with it into the universal element with which it has perpetual sympathy."

Bulwer Lytton wrote :

"Poetry pervaded the thoughts, it inspired the similes, it hymned in the majestic sentences of the wisest of mankind."

Similar opinions might be quoted from many other distinguished literary authorities.

One testimony as to Shakespeare's prose will suffice. Thomas Carlyle placed the prose of Shakespeare so high that he expressed the opinion that had Shakespeare written prose instead of poetry he would have attained greater fame even than he has attained. If that opinion be correct, and it is not merely confirmed by Professor Churton Collins, but substantiated by the examples he gives, then Shakespeare possessed a faculty not far short of supreme for prose and prose themes, and with quite a supreme faculty for impassioned verse. The incredible is realised in this author.

It only remains for the identity of the author to be settled. Was he the irregular genius whom Mr. Robinson recognises, but whom Coleridge scouts, or Bacon? But Mr. Robertson admits that Bacon possessed a faculty not far short of supreme for prose and prose themes, and Spedding declares that he was not without the fine frenzy of a poet, and that had his genius taken the ordinary direction it would have carried him to a place among the great poets. Shelley, Bulwer Lytton, Taine, Lord Campbell, Macaulay, Walter Landor Savage, and others of equal eminence in literature, proclaim him in superlative terms to have been a poet. So the incredible was also realised in Francis Bacon. This is, therefore, a double miracle, unless the works under both names were written by one man.

These opinions from both sides of the argument—Shakespeare's capacity for writing prose, Bacon's powers as a poet—completely confute Mr. Robertson's opinion and destroy the point of his arguments. And, let it be observed, the confutation does not come from Baconians.

Bacon had taken all knowledge to be his province, as indeed had the author of the plays. Bacon was not

tied by destiny during the twenty years to law and politics. Historical records confute this statement. During the twenty years, 1585 to 1605, or more correctly, the twenty-seven years, 1579 to 1605, no occupations of Bacon can be cited to account for one-tenth of the time. His life, as related by Spedding, was not a crowded one, but exactly the reverse. The plays were not the main stock of a London theatre. There is no contemporary evidence that they were. Every one of these statements of Mr. Robertson is the reverse of the fact.

There is yet to be considered an appeal to history in the following paragraph (p. 323):

"Not in all literature is there a known instance of a literary prodigy that could be remotely compared with such a miracle as the production of the *Novum Organum* and *Lear*, the *New Atlantis* and *Twelfth Night*, *Romeo and Juliet* and the *Essay on Love* by the same man, even if we consider them solely as forms of literary output, without reference to the intellectual predilections involved. . . . Those who are not repelled by the 'fierce impossibility' of such a conjuncture, have thus far had set before them a number of concrete proofs that it did not take place."

This argument is ludicrously weak even for Mr. Robertson to put forward. Once more he treads Bacon's law underfoot and goes about his task "with a more complete disregard of inductive research than was shown by any alchemist or physicist in Bacon's age." Because it *has* not been, it *cannot* be. What says the great philosopher? "For the wonders of Nature commonly lie out of the high road and beaten paths, so as the very absurdity of an attempt may sometimes be prosperous." The conjuncture took place, and the day is not far distant when there will be a general recognition of the fact.

11 The greatest of all Bacon's preoccupations (the late
3

Mr. Andrew Lang's favourite expression) is said to be "the comprehensive revision and reconstruction of scientific lore of all kinds, naturalist and humanist." It is impossible to misrepresent Bacon more completely than has been done in this sentence. If Mr. Robertson is right, Bacon was a disputant and not a reformer.

Bacon sought the good of all men. His object was that he might instruct the minds of men unto virtue. That was his life's ambition, that was his life's work. Every step which he took was to this end. "As for myself," he said, "I have often wittingly and willingly neglected the glory of my own Name and Learning (if any such thing be) both in the works I now publish and in those I contrive for hereafter, whilst I study to advance the good and profit of mankind." That was his "main aim" as stated in "his signed writings." He bent his powers year after year to achieve this great aim.

Has Mr. Robertson read the Shakespeare plays? Having read them can he say that they were written to entertain the illiterate and profligate audiences that frequented the Elizabethan theatres? In view of the "purpose of playing whose end both at the first and now, was and is, to hold as 'twere the mirror up to nature to show virtue her own feature, scorn her own image, and the very age and body of the time his form and pressure," how can Mr. Robertson say that if Baconians attribute the plays to Bacon "they must imagine Bacon striving to drown his scientific cares in drama as other men seek to drown pecuniary cares in drink." How low must be his estimate of the value of those plays! He can see no purpose in them except that of entertaining the audiences at the Globe Theatre. "No trace in the plays of any attempt to further the aims of the Advancement of Learning"! Bacon "alternately absorbed in an immense philosophic ambition and in a nerve wearing career of theatrical

craftsmanship, from which every thought of Baconian propaganda was expelled"! Could any wilder and more irresponsible sentences than these be penned?

Thus does Mr. Robertson "proceed from inconsequence to inconsequence." He considers that Baconians must be baffled because Copernicus is not mentioned in the plays! because the author wrote obtusely (which he did not) of Machiavelli in blank verse! because atheism and theology are not mentioned! because the word "philosophical" only once occurs! because the author did not scheme to introduce "A New Instauration" of the sciences in the plays! because he was in no wise zealous to vindicate dogmatic orthodoxy! Bacon was all for moral and intellectual improvement, therefore he could not have written the plays! One can hardly believe that John M. Robertson wrote "The Baconian Heresy." "It is all too blankly impossible."

THE INTELLECTUAL INTERESTS OF SHAKESPEARE AND BACON.

The most amusing chapter in "The Baconian Heresy" is that which is headed "The Intellectual Interests of Shakespeare and Bacon." It does not contain one sentence bearing upon the intellectual interests of Shakespeare! Only in the last sentence (and it is the last word in it) is the name even mentioned. There, without a pretence of supporting the statement with any proof, the writer asserts concerning the plays that "the general authorship and source of adaption can be vested in no other man than the actor-partner Shakespeare." Mr. Robertson has failed to find what were the intellectual interests of Shakespeare, and for this very good reason—that there have never been any heard of.

Mr. Robertson's opinion of Bacon's literary tastes is thus expressed :—

"His few excursions into pure belles lettres, apart from the Essays (1625) are but passing diversions; the Conference of Pleasure,* the version of a few of the Psalms (1625) tell of small predilection to pure literature for literature's sake. Of the Essays and the History of Henry the Seventh (1622) alone among the larger undertakings could it be said that they are in any large measure outside the social and philosophical purposes which mainly swayed their author; and even these, written as they partly were with an eye to getting an audience for the other works, are so far currents. Wide as it is, then, the mental outlook of Bacon has one prevailing bent. Persistently he strove and hoped to lead the mind of his time in matters of natural science by better paths than those it appeared to him to be treading."

Exactly what Mr. Robertson is thinking of when he says the Essays and "History of Henry VII." were written with an eye to getting an audience for his other works is difficult to appreciate. "The Two Books on the Advancement of Learning" was published in English; "Novum Organum" was in Latin. These and the "De Sapientia" were all the other books Bacon had published.

This Chapter XIII. is mainly devoted to an attempt to represent that the Shakespeare plays could not have been included in Bacon's "intellectual interests," and the controversialist has garbled Bacon's words and misrepresented the position he took up. But it is necessary to point out how absolutely Mr. Robertson, following Spedding, has failed to realise what was the great object Bacon had in view throughout his life, and in order to make this failure clear some further quotations from the text must be given.

Mr. Robertson says:—

"Unless they deny it, the Baconians must be presumed to see that Bacon throughout the mass of his avowed writings, has

*Not published until Spedding's edition, 1870, and not previously attributed to Bacon.

an end in view; that he is profoundly concerned to influence public opinion. Yet they impute to him the deliberate assumption of the time-devouring task of writing dozens of stage plays, in not one of which are his intellectual purposes so much as hinted at. They conceive him writing *Love's Labour Lost*, etc., etc., with all his life's ambition still unfulfilled; with the sciences in his opinion still misdirected; with the 'idols' of the tribe and the cave, the theatre and the market place, all along in command of the general allegiance. Possessed as he was by the vision of a world to reform, both on the intellectual and on the political side, we are to conceive him bending his powers year after year to the entertainment of the audiences of the Globe Theatre.

"They (the Baconians) must stand to the old German theorem of some profound didactic purpose that inspires all the plays, . . . or they must make the assumption that Bacon wrote the Plays in order to get away mentally from all his didactic ideals. As the didactic ideals of his works are specific and reiterated, while any implied in the plays are simply those of normal and accepted ethics, they can have no refuge save in the second alternative. They must imagine Bacon striving to drown his scientific cares in drama as other men seek to drown pecuniary cares in drink. Whatever they may say about his doctrine of dramatic teaching in the *Advancement of Learning*, they can find no trace in the plays of any attempt to further the aims of that treatise. They must picture Bacon as a literary Jekyll and Hyde, alternately absorbed in an immense philosophic ambition and in a nerve-wearing career of theatrical craftsmanship, from which every thought of Baconian propaganda was expelled.

"The Plays are, in a word, the composition of a man not at all occupied with problems of scientific reform."

How can this extraordinary view be reconciled with the facts? There is, during the first forty-five years of Bacon's life, no more evidence that he was preoccupied with problems of scientific reform, or that he had scientific cares, than that he was engaged in writing the Shakespeare poems and plays. The "*Cogitata et Visa*" was not printed until 1663, when it was published by Gruter. There is a manuscript copy of it in the

library at Queen's College, Oxford, revised and corrected in Bacon's handwriting. This copy differs on material points from Gruter's copy. The date when it was written may be arrived at by a letter, dated 19th February, 1608, from Thomas Bodley to Bacon, acknowledging receipt of a copy. In this letter Bodley, after speaking in eulogistic terms of the author, whom he describes as a master-workman, criticises some features of the work, and in concluding introduces this mysterious sentence: "Which course would to God (to wisper as much in your ears) you had followed at first, when you fell to the study of such a thing as was not worthy such a student." A translation of the work has never been published in English. It is only a tract containing about 10,000 words, but it does not show Bacon as needing relaxation from his scientific cares. The "*Novum Organum*," the first book of which is an amplification of the "*Cogitata et Visa*," was published in 1620 with the "*Parasceve*." Bacon was sixty years of age before he gave to the world, and then only in Latin, any indication that he was preoccupied with problems of scientific reform! But even then there was no clear statement of what has been termed his inductive method. Let the reader refer to Spedding's Preface to the "*Parasceve*"* and read the dialogue therein, which was written by Spedding in 1847. The result of the examination as to its practical utility is this:—"No attempt has been made that I [Spedding] can hear of to carry the work further."

The "*Novum Organum*" received severe criticism when it was published. Coke said it was only fit to freight the ship of fools, and King James made the witty remark that "It was like the peace of God, it passeth all understanding." And yet, translated into English, the first book is one of the most fascinating

* "*Works*," Vol. i., page 369.

books in the language. It reads as the work of one who "had not his knowledge from books, but from some grounds and notions within himself."

That Bacon was always keenly interested in all scientific questions is beyond question; but that all his life he was preoccupied with problems of science to the exclusion of other pursuits, is about as far from the truth as it is possible for anything to be. Mr. Robertson is quite right when he says the mass of his avowed writings has an end in view, except that to apply the word "mass" to his avowed writings is inappropriate, for they are so few and so slight.

"That he is profoundly concerned to influence opinion" is not accurate; for opinions Bacon cared not one fig. He was profoundly concerned to influence men's action and intellectual advancement. The whole of this Chapter XIII. is based on a thorough misconception of Francis Bacon, of his intellectual interests, of his attainments, of his character, of his objects, and of his works. "To his master-purpose he directed the advancement of learning." True! but what was his master-purpose? Was, as Mr. Robertson alleges, all his life's ambition unfulfilled?

It is immaterial whether or not Bacon wrote the Shakespeare poems and plays. The real problem is to arrive at some reliable conclusion as to what he was doing during the first forty-five years of his life. If Mr. Robertson is right, the world has never known a greater tragedy than that life. But every shred of testimony and evidence that exists goes to prove that he is as wrong as wrong can be.

Bacon states that until he was thirty-one Burleigh has been carrying him on, that he was neither slothful or prodigal. But he had exhausted his mother's and brother's resources; Burleigh would go no further, "and then came his determination to sell his inheritance and

purchase some lease of quick revenue" that might be executed by another and become a sorry bookmaker.

In all this history there is not one word to justify the talk about preoccupation in problems of science. It is book-making that is Bacon's goal. Yet no publication had appeared under his own name! When he was 37, ten short essays; and at 45, "The Two Books on the Advancement of Learning." The first book is just a ramble, full of anecdote and similitudes. The second book is a general exposition of how men should proceed in the pursuit of knowledge. Poesy—dramatic poesy—it deals with; every conceivable subject is reviewed, but it contains no evidence that the writer is preoccupied with problems of science. But everything that Bacon marks as deficient had either been previously supplied, or was being supplied at the time.

This chapter reveals not only Mr. Robertson's mistaken impressions of Bacon, but his want of preception of the object and value of the plays. Had they been to others what they are to Mr. Robertson, they would have been to-day known only to students of the literature of the period; they were not written for representation at the public theatres. No one who has any knowledge of the Elizabethan theatres, of the conditions under which plays were produced at them, or of the audiences which frequented them, can for one moment believe that the Shakespeare plays were produced as printed at the public theatres. Two hundred years had to elapse before their supreme merit was recognised. The author of the sonnets knew this would be the case, as did the writer of the panegyric prefixed to the 1623 Folio. Mr. Robertson expects to find in the writings on philosophical and educational subjects of an old man of sixty years the ideas, aspirations, passions, vocabulary, and style which a brilliant young man in his teens and early manhood would employ. And because they vary, he ex-

claims, "It is all too blankly unplausible for more detailed discussion," and indulges in such an assertion as this: "The rational and natural reading of the facts yields a perfectly intelligible situation: the Baconian theory reduces it, as usual, to a nightmare." A little knowledge is a dangerous thing, and Chapter XIII. reveals this fact—that having lived "in the spiritual society of Shakespeare and Bacon as much as most men of letters," Mr. Robertson has only been able to acquire just as little or as much knowledge of either the one or the other as becomes a very dangerous thing. As regards the author of the Shakespeare plays, the truth of this statement is made evident from the attempt to explain away Emerson's epigram, "I cannot marry this fact (the life of the Stratford man) to his verse."

This is the explanation:

"He (Emerson) had formed an ideal of a supreme intellect, identifying genius for utterance with genius in universal judgment, a commanding power for speech with command over all environment. And Emerson's lead has been followed by those—University men and others—unable to conceive how the greatest English poet can have been a man of short schooling, who gathered what knowledge he had outside of libraries and colleges. They first grossly exaggerated his knowledge under the spell of his art, ascribing to him scholarship and legal and other acquirements which he did not possess; then they call for a man who shall square with their ideal. And so we have the 'Baconian' theory and the 'Anti-Stratfordian argument.'"

The whole question at issue is raised in this extract. The testimony of those who have devoted themselves to the study of Shakespeare's works (Farmer cannot be included in this category, for he has left no evidence of being more than a smatterer) is that the author possessed a supreme intellect, a genius for universal knowledge and command over all environment (page 8). Mr. Robertson states that "no expert in Elizabethan litera-

ture, indeed, no good scholar in English literature, has ever held the heresy." This is incorrect ; but, however thorough a man's knowledge of Elizabethan literature, and indeed English literature, might be, if he doubted the Stratfordian authorship, or believed in the Baconian authorship, it would not be admitted that he was an expert in the one or a good scholar of the other. Sixty years ago, Professor David Masson thus described the author of the Shakespeare plays :—"We have Thought, History, Exposition, Philosophy, all within the round of the poet. It is as if into a mind poetical in form there had been poured all the matter that existed in the mind of his contemporary, Bacon. The only difference between him and Bacon, sometimes, is that Bacon writes an essay and calls it his own ; while Shakespeare writes a similar essay, and puts in into the mouth of a Ulysses or Polonius." *

The problem is not that the greatest students of Shakespeare's works are "unable to conceive how the greatest English poet can have been a man of short learning, who gathered what knowledge he had outside of libraries and colleges." It is this—that the authenticated facts as to the life of the Stratford man, and the traditions as to that life, are not only insufficient to account for the knowledge and learning displayed in the poems and plays, but are in the main inconsistent with the possibility of the Stratford man being the author.

The sophistry with which Mr. Robertson endeavours to bolster up this new theory is palpable. It abounds in misstatements and contradictions. It is supported by untenable hypotheses. It displays a remarkable ignorance of the Elizabethan theatres and the conditions under which plays were produced at them. The

* Wordsworth, Shelley and Keats, and other Essays, 1874 ; Essay V., p. 242, reprinted from "North British Review," 1853.

attempted refutation of the *a priori* side of the Baconian theory and the anti-Stratfordian argument is built up on assumption and inconsistencies which, in their extravagance, far exceed anything which has been put forward by advocates of that theory and that argument.

THE PROSE AND LITERARY STYLES OF SHAKESPEARE AND BACON.

"The Baconian Heresy" has been received with a chorus of approval by the reviewers. Objection has, however, been taken by several of them to the conclusions of the author with reference to the prose of Shakespeare. The brilliance of the poet's verse had obscured the merit of his prose until Thomas Carlyle, and more recently the late Professor Churton Collins, drew attention to its great qualities. During the century and a-half in which his works were studied from nearly every point of view, the contemplation of Shakespeare as a prose-writer escaped the vigilance of the commentators. Professor Churton Collins in an article in "Studies in Shakespeare" dealt exhaustively with the subject. Mr. Robertson affirms that Shakespeare is not a great writer of prose. It was essential for his case that he should say so. Professor Collins thus states his opinion:—

"The truth is that Shakespeare's prose is a phenomenon as remarkable as his verse. In one way it is still more remarkable. The prose of Shakespeare stands alone. It was his own creation, as absolutely his own as the terza rima was Dante's, as the Spenserian stanza was Spenser's. For every other form of composition he had models, which he began by following very exactly. . . . But his prose is essentially original; and how greatly he contributed to the development of this important branch of rhetoric will be at once apparent, if we compare his prose diction with the diction, both of those who preceded him and those who followed him. What, then, did Shakespeare do for English prose? He was the creator of

colloquial prose, of the prose most appropriate for drama. He showed for the first time how that prose could be dignified without being pedantic; how it could be full and massive without subordinating the Saxon to the Latin element; how it could be stately without being involved; how it could be musical without losing its rhythm and its cadence from the rhetoricians of Rome. He made it plastic. He taught it to assume, and to assume with propriety every tone. He showed its capacity for dialectics, for exposition, for narrative, for soliloquy. He purified it from archaisms. Indeed, his diction often differs little from that of the best writers of the eighteenth century."

Then follows an extract from the Epilogue to 2 *Henry IV.* which, it is asserted, in point of purity, rhythm and composition, will bear comparison with any paragraph in Addison.

Professor Collins, in examining Shakespeare's prose, discerns five styles—(1) the euphuistic; (2) the coarse colloquial prose, modelled on the language of vulgar life; (3) the prose of higher comedy; (4) prose professedly rhetorical; (5) highly-wrought poetical prose. It is impossible here to reproduce the scholarly and convincing process by which, with the aid of illustrations, the writer supports his contentions. In Hamlet's speech to his fellow-students in Act II., Scene ii., it is maintained that Shakespeare has raised prose to the sublimest pitch of verse:—"His poetical conceptions naturally and spontaneously clothe themselves in verse, while all that appertains to the familiar side of real life as naturally slides into its appropriate prose. The line of demarcation thus drawn between verse and prose is another proof of Shakespeare's delicate appreciation of style, another proof that he was what the French critics deny—a reflective artist." Let it be repeated that Carlyle expressed the opinion that Shakespeare would have done far better had he confined himself to prose.

To the important bearing which all this has on the question of the authorship, Mr. Robertson is fully

alive. He does not mention Professor Collins' article, although he had it in his mind. His readers may not have seen it, and so he runs a-tilt at Shakespeare's prose in the hope of influencing their minds. He gives twenty-nine prose extracts from the plays. Verve and vivacity, he says, they exhibit, fluency and fire, an endless fecundity of phrase, image and epithet, but not a great architectonic prose. But who would expect to find architectonic prose in the plays? Let anyone acquainted with the plays read Professor Collins' article and compare his method of examination with that of Mr. Robertson, and he cannot fail to arrive at the conclusion that the prose of Shakespeare is as remarkable for its dignity and beauty as is his verse.

In comparing the prose style of Bacon with that of Shakespeare, three extracts are given from the Essays, two from the "Advancement of Learning," and one from "Henry VII."

The Essays are condensed and pithy, consisting of suggestions or hints rather than dissertations. Bacon could never free himself from discursiveness, and they abound in imagery, similitude, and anecdotal sentences. The style, however, is very similar to that of much of the prose of Shakespeare. Long before there was any Baconian theory, Alexander Smith, himself a poet, essayist and critic, wrote: "He (Bacon) seems to have written his Essays with the pen of Shakespeare." He, then, was struck with the similarity. Professor Masson's opinion to the same effect has already been quoted.* The three extracts given in "The Baconian Heresy" are not representative of the whole. The best method of comparison is for the reader to take a copy of the Essays and read sentences taken promiscuously, and in a similar manner read sentences from the twenty-nine prose passages from Shakespeare given. He cannot

fail to be struck with the similarity in diction, rhythm, phrasing and style. But here again must be borne in mind the chronological position of the works compared. *Love's Labour Lost* was probably written as early as 1579 (Bacon was then 19, with all his life's ambition still unfulfilled); only ten of the Essays were published before 1612, and in their final form only in 1625. Is there a man who would not materially alter his style when writing after an interval of nearly fifty years? The disparity would be intensified by the difference in the language required for the purpose of a play and for an essay.

This may be said—that if the following passage was placed before any student unacquainted with the source from which it was taken, but familiar with Bacon's writings, he would not hesitate to attribute the authorship to Bacon :—

"Now, if these men have defeated the law and outrun native punishment, though they can outstrip men, they have no wings to fly from God. Warre is the beadle. Warre is his vengeance. So that here men are punished for before-breach of the King's lawes, in now the King's quarrel. When they feared the death they have borne life away ; and where they would be safe they perish. Then if they dye unprovided, no more is the King guiltie of their damnation than hee was before guiltie of those impieties for the which they are now visited. Every subject's duty is the King's, but every subject's soul is his own." °

The extract given from the introduction to the "Advancement of Learning" is certainly not characteristic of Bacon's usual style. It represents his "nobly censorious style." It is of the graver periodic structure. From "Henry VII." is selected the opening sentence, which is quite dissimilar from by far the greater part of the history. This, too, is of the style which Jonson characterised as "nobly censorious." How complete is

° Henry V.

the difference between that, the first sentence, and the last sentences of the History. It concludes thus:—

“Hee was born at Pembroke Castle, and lyeth buried at Westminster in one of the Stateliest and Daintiest Monuments of Europe, both for the Chappell, and for the Sepulchor. So that hee dwelleth more richly Dead, in the Monument of his Tombe, than hee did in Richmond or any of his Palaces. I could wish hee did the like, in this Monument of his Fame.”

That might have been written with the pen of Shakespeare.

Baconians may indeed retort that if Mr. Robertson considers the specimens he has given to be representative of Bacon's prose style, he cannot have read the greater part of his writings; or, adopting the method of argument which he pursues throughout his book, may they not exclaim that “inconsequence proceeds from inconsequence” when he triumphantly claims that Bacon could not have written the plays, because he finds “owing to” in the sense of “accruing to” in an essay, and the word “owing” occurs only once in the Shakespeare plays? How unsubstantial must be the case that requires to be bolstered up with such futilities?

No writer has shown more versatility in style than Bacon. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in his book “Francis Bacon: An Account of his Life and Works,”* writes (page 447):—

“Bacon's style varied almost as much as his handwriting; but it was influenced more by subject matter than by youth or old age. Few men have shown equal versatility in adapting their language to the slightest shade of circumstance and purpose. His style depended upon whether he was addressing a king or a great nobleman, or a philosopher or a friend; whether he was composing a State paper, pleading in a State trial, magnifying the Prerogative, extolling Truth, discussing studies,

* MacMillan and Co., 1885.

exhorting a judge, sending a New Year's present, or sounding a trumpet to prepare the way for the Kingdom of Man over Nature. It is a mistake to suppose that Bacon was never florid till he grew old. On the contrary, in the early *Devices*, written during his connection with Essex, he uses a rich exuberant style and poetic rhythm; but he prefers the rhetorical question of appeal to the complex period."

Mr. Robertson has made no mention of the "*Sylva Sylvarum*," the most bulky work of Bacon which is written in the English language. Does he there find any examples of "architectonic prose"? Is there found there "the deliberation and balance of the exposition, the fore-planned arrangement of the thoughts"? Surely the literary style of this work differs more from the *Essays* and "*Advancement of Learning*" than do they from the Shakespeare prose. Has Mr. Robertson read Rawley's Preface to it and noticed the following passage in it?

"I have heard his lordship say also, that one great Reason, why he would not put these particulars into an exact Method (though he that looketh attentively into them, shall find they have a secret order)," etc.

Mr. Robertson again asserts, and makes a strong point of his assertion, that few great poets have been good writers of prose. His remarks may be thus summarized: Dryden, in his day reputed a great poet and a good writer of prose, would not to-day be placed in the highest rank of either art. Dante wrote prose and verse, but no one ever ranked him with the great prosists. Milton has as high a twofold fame as any, but criticism to-day leans more and more to the opinion that his finest English tractate is rather a splendid example of mistaken prose than a triumph of prose art comparable to his poetry. Wordsworth and Coleridge wrote some excellent prose and some perfect verse, but more inferior verse than good. Shelley's prose never won

much praise. Byron and Keats wrote letters and notes exhibiting plenty of prose power, but neither attempted a prose work. Tennyson and Browning hardly attempted to write prose save by way of jottings. Apart from Milton, Wordsworth, and Coleridge, amongst great poets there are only Goethe, Heine, Poe, Leopardi, Hugo, and Arnold, whose prose notably competes in fame with their verse. The deduction to be made by the reader from these opinions of Mr. Robertson is that Shakespeare, being a great poet, could not have written great prose, and Bacon, being a great prose writer (although not a supreme master of prose !), could not have written great poetry. Is it possible to conceive any argument more feeble ? But it demonstrates clearly how utterly Mr. Robertson has failed to realise the qualities of the intellect and the pre-eminence in literature which the author of the Shakespeare poems and plays and which Bacon enjoy, notwithstanding his boast that he has lived "as much in the spiritual society of both Shakespeare and Bacon as the majority of men of letters." The real Shakespeare, the real Bacon, Mr. Robertson has never seen ; into their spiritual society he has never entered. Every page in "The Baconian Heresy" proclaims this fact.

THE VOCABULARIES OF BACON AND SHAKESPEARE.

Mr. Robertson devotes a short chapter to this subject. As to Bacon's vocabulary, he expresses no opinion. He remarks : "Of Bacon, unfortunately, there is no concordance ; the Baconians have done nothing so useful as that" (as what ?) But there is no attempt on his part to make a comparison between the vocabulary which Bacon uses, say, in the *Essays* and "The *Sylva Sylvarum*," or "The *Advancement of Learning*" and "Henry VII." There is no attempt to show that Bacon's works were built up with practically the same

stock of words; that he did not use a different vocabulary for each work, although it is essential for him to establish this fact in order to justify the argument upon which his contentions are based.

As to Shakespeare's vocabulary, he makes the following suggestion :—

"That the playwright was really not a man of supremely large vocabulary for his time; the impression set up by a long scrutiny of the concordance is rather one of surprise at the large number of words familiar to educated men which do not appear in it, and the large number which appear only once."

And then he adds, and special attention is directed to his words :—

"Multitudes of them, of course, he must have known."

What does Mr. Robertson's argument amount to? He has taken (1) the two first pages of "The Advancement of Learning"; (2) the last page of Book I. and the first of Book II.; (3) the last two pages of Book II.; (4) a sequence at random of four pages in the same book; (5) the first and the last of the Essays; (6) the first page of the "New Atlantis"; and (7) the first two and the last two pages of the "History of Henry VII." He has compared the words found in these passages with a concordance of Shakespeare and he finds that there are words in these passages which are not used in the Shakespeare plays, as follows: In (1) first page 7 words, second page 16 words; (2) last page of Book I. 11 words; first page of Book II. 8 words; (3) two last pages of Book II. 29 words; (4) four pages taken at random 49 words; (5) first and last of the Essays (16 pages in the 1625 edition) 39 words.

The result of the examination of Nos. 6 and 7 are not given!

What conclusion does Mr. Robertson arrive at from this comparison?

"The vocabularies of Shakespeare and Bacon are markedly and decisively distinct."

"We are contemplating too different verbal outfits, so to speak; two largely different selections from the stores of words common to all for all purposes; two diverging sets of preferences—in a word the output of two differently cultured men."

Surely Mr. Robertson has tripped here in bracketing together Shakespeare and Bacon as "two differently cultured men." Hitherto he has not admitted that Shakespeare was a cultured man. Here he ranges him alongside Bacon. But this point is beside the argument of this chapter.

A comparison is made between plays which Mr. Robertson affirms were written for the purpose of entertaining the audiences which frequented the Globe Theatre, which audiences Mr. Halliwell-Phillips states (and this is confirmed by all the contemporary testimony) were illiterate and for the most part profligate, and what Mr. Robertson describes as "the philosophical work of a man who had taken all knowledge to be his province and who was pre-occupied with scientific investigation."

Because there are a number of words used in the passages taken from Bacon's works which are not in the Shakespeare plays, Mr. Robertson in his emphatic style avows that it is a concrete proof that the author of *Hamlet* was not the author of "De Augmentis"! Could any argument more insufficient be advanced? There are hundreds of words used in the Essays which are not to be found in the "New Atlantis." There are at least a thousand words in the "Sylva Sylvarum" which are not to be found in "The Advancement of Learning." To apply Mr. Robertson's precious argument, it follows that if Bacon wrote the Essays he did not write the "New Atlantis," and if he wrote the "Sylva Sylvarum"

he did not write "The Advancement of Learning." And this argument has much more force in comparing these works than in comparing works so dissimilar in character, though not in object, as the Shakespeare plays and "The Advancement of Learning." So another example is afforded of how with Mr. Robertson "inconsequence follows inconsequence." Here, as throughout "The Baconian Heresy," he endeavours to conceal the weakness of the arguments and to carry conviction to his readers by the arrogance of his assertion and the scorn which he heaps upon his opponents.

It is unfortunate that there is no concordance of Bacon's works. It is a pity that Mr. Robertson has not devoted his industry and scholarship to the task. The result would be more useful than indulging in abuse of Baconians.

A concordance of the "Sylva Sylvarum" is nearly completed, and several years ago the Bacon Society had under consideration its publication. It was considered, however, that the whole of the works should be concorded before the expense of publishing could be undertaken.

There have been reliable estimates made by competent scholars as to Shakespeare's vocabulary. Clark, in his "Elements of the English Language," p. 134, says :

"The vocabulary of Shakespeare becomes more than double that of any other writer in the English language. Craik estimated it at twenty-one thousand words, without counting inflectional forms, while that of Milton was but seven thousand. . . . English speech, as well as literature, owes more to him than to any other man."

Max Muller, in his "Science of Languages," writes :

"Shakespeare displayed a greater variety of expression than probably any other writer in any language."

Bartlet's concordance of Shakespeare, which includes

inflections, gives approximately 80,000 words! Cowden Clarke's concordance contains nearly as many. Mr. Robertson had one or the other of these before him when he made the comparisons before referred to. If he had made a simple calculation it *might* have saved him from making such a foolish suggestion as "that the playwright was really not a man of supreme vocabulary for his time."

If, as Mr. Robertson affirms, a long scrutiny of the concordance occasions an expression of surprise at the large number of words, multitudes of which Shakespeare must have known, which do not appear in it, and the large number which appear only once, why should there be any surprise that there should be found words in Bacon's philosophical works which are not used in the plays? Many of the words Mr. Robertson has enumerated are wholly unfitted for use in poetry. Take for instance, affirmatively, amplification, triplicity, universality, consociate, amplitude, overcome, renovations, concordances, privatively, prolix, liturgy, occupy, preoccupate, privatively, animosities, emergent, multiplically, rigorously, perigrinations, Sabaoth, participant, reluctance, contradictories, enucleating, interdicteth, mediocrity, nonsignificants, surd, embaseth, mummeries, theological, abstruse, accurate, arietations, enervate, sustentation—none of these words lend themselves for employment in verse. Or again, elocution, oblation, tabernacle, signature, barleycorn, liturgy, summary, atheism, libertine (adj.), aphorism, preamble, theology, chess, dialectic, draughts (= written rules), ward (of a lock), astrologer, dispeople, mountainous, philology, schism—are not these words which would only be made use of if the subject of the verse demanded their interpolation? And yet the whole fabric of Mr. Robertson's argument, founded on the vocabularies—that the two sets of works could not have been produced by one man—

rests on the fact that these words are not met with in a concordance of Shakespeare! Mr. Robertson reels off a multitude of questions as if each one was a poser for his opponents. Here are some from which the reader may judge how ridiculous is the position adopted.

"How should Bacon use the terms, 'theory' and 'theoric' freely in his didactic works, and only 'theorick' (and that only thrice) in the thirty-seven plays?"

"How, after writing often of *politiques* in his avowed works, should he always write 'politicans' in his alleged plays, when other dramatists (e.g., Ben Jonson) used '*politiques*'?"

"Why should he write 'overcomen' and 'holpen' in his prose and never in his poetry?"

"Why should he always use the spelling 'drought' in his signed works, and 'drouth' when writing dramatically?"

"How should it be possible to him to write of 'vicissitude' seven times in one essay,* and never once in thirty-seven plays?"

Is it not possible, even probable, that a man might make variations as wide, or even wider, than the foregoing between the use of words in prose and in dramatic poetry?

The writer of the plays was an aristocrat, and was conversant with the habits and language of the Courts of England and France. The plays, almost without exception, have their movement in the highest walks of Society. There is not one play which affords the suggestion that it was written by a man who was one of the people or had risen from the people. It is always the point of view of the aristocrat that is evident. Bacon speaks of "the ignorant and rude multitude," Shakespeare of "the rude multitude; the base vulgar."

Both the philosopher and dramatist appropriate in the most barefaced manner the production of other writers. Rawley describes Bacon as lighting his torch at every man's candles, and this was a constant practice

* The title of the essays was 'On vicissitudes.'

of Shakespeare's. Both were very fond of punning. They never tired of cultivating the habit. There are numerous references to St. Albans; not one to Stratford-on-Avon, and few to Warwickshire. Both were inattentive to accuracy in details. Bacon's Apothegms abound in historical inaccuracies. In several cases Shakespeare and Bacon make identical errors. It is apparent to the thoughtful reader that the author of each set of works wrote from an abnormally stored memory without reference to authorities. It has been truly said that Bacon and Shakespeare both differ from other authors in this characteristic—they never argue, they decree. On every subject they speak from the same point of view.

There is another point which does not appear to have been noted. Whoever wrote the Shakespeare plays was the most perfect orator of his time, and of all times. Never man spake like this man. The chief characteristic of the orator is the possession of a faculty for instinctively using words to express thoughts which give pleasure to the auditor as they fall upon his ear. It is the music of the words which an orator speaks which fascinates his hearers, and makes them wish that he should not stop. Shakespeare possessed this faculty as it has never been possessed before. The fear of Bacon's audiences was lest he should leave off. Archbishop Whateley says of Shakespeare, “The first of dramatists, he might easily have been the first of orators.”

And so it comes to pass that the more carefully and penetratingly the student examines the works of Bacon and the poems and plays of Shakespeare, the more striking appear to be the similarities between the two authors. The more diligent and painstaking the investigation the more certain is the result. No man has lived at any period of history who possessed every qualification requisite for writing the plays and poems

bearing the name of William Shakespeare, except Francis Bacon. That is the broad basis of the Baconian faith.

"THE HYSTORIE OF HAMBLET."

DR. RICHARD FARMER'S reference in his Essay on the "Learning of Shakespeare," to this rare novel affords a striking instance of his unreliability as a commentator and critic.

In 1748 was published "An Enquiry into the Learning of Shakespeare, with remarks on several passages of his Plays," by Peter Whalley, B.A. This writer was a fellow of St. John's College, Oxford, and became master of the Grammar School of Christ's Hospital. He published in 1756 an edition of Jonson's works, which was more complete than any of its predecessors, and had the advantage of being accompanied by a life of that poet. In his Enquiry, Whalley contends that Shakespeare must have read "Saxo Grammaticus," in Latin, as he derived the plot of *Hamlet* from it, and no translation of the work into any modern language had been made.

Farmer in the 1657 edition of his Essay observes:

"But the truth is he did not take it from Saxo at all; a Novel called 'The Historie of Hamblet' was his original; a fragment of which in black lettèr I have been favoured with by a very curious and intelligent gentleman, to whom lovers of Shakespeare will some time or other owe their obligations."

In the 1789 edition Dr. Farmer amplifies his statement thus:—

"It hath indeed been said, that if such an history exists, it is almost impossible that any poet unacquainted with the Latin language (supposing his perceptive faculties to have been ever so acute) could have caught the characteristical madness of

Hamblet, described by Saxo Grammaticus, so happily is it delivered by Shakespeare.”

There follows an extract from the novel, consisting of Hamblet's speech to his mother in her chamber, and then Farmer goes on to explain that Mr. Capell, his communicative friend before mentioned, has obtained from the collection of the Duke of Newcastle a complete copy of “The Hystorie of Hamblet,” which proves to be a translation from the French of Belleforest; and, adds Farmer, Mr. Capell states that :

“All the chief incidents of the Play, and all the capital characters are there in embryo, after a rude and barbarous manner; sentiments indeed, there are none, that Shakespeare could borrow; nor any expression but one, which is, where Hamlet kills Polonius behind the arras; in doing which he is made to cry out, as in the Play, ‘A rat! a rat!’”

Dr. Farmer, in his usual positive manner, adds: “So much for ‘Saxo Grammaticus!’”

There is one very important fact connected with this translation which Dr. Farmer was shrewd enough not to reveal. The Hystorie is undated, and on the face of it there is no evidence that it preceded the play of *Hamlet*. Without proof on this point the argument fails to have any force.

The copy of the black-letter Quarto, owned by Capell, is the only one known, and is preserved among his books at Cambridge. It was reprinted in 1841 by Collier, in the first volume of his “Shakespeare's Library.” It is given *in extenso* in the Variorum edition of *Hamlet*, by Furness, Vol. II. Capell points out that amidst all the resemblance of persons and circumstances, it is strange that none of the relater's expressions have got into “the play”; and yet not one of them is to be found, except in Chapter III., when Hamlet kills the counsellor behind the arras, and in doing so, cries out, “A rat! a rat!” After this ensues Hamlet's harangue

to his mother, which Capell describes as the only good stroke in the Hystorie.

Francis de Belleforest, a French gentlemen, published a collection of novels; in part, originals; in part, translations, chiefly from Bendello. The first tome appeared in 1564; the dedication to the fifth is dated 1570. The black-letter quarto to which Farmer refers is a translation of one of these novels; the date of this translation has not be ascertained. Professor Elze contends that the translation from Belleforest is of a later date than the play, for the following reasons. It is noticeable in the popular legends of both England and Germany that prose versions invariably follow the poetical version. It is readily conceivable that a poet should select from Belleforest the story of Hamlet's feigned insanity and of his revenge, and cast it into a dramatic or poetic mould; but it is not so conceivable that a mediocre translator should pick out this single story *unless he was led to it* by the popularity of the poetical version. The clumsy translation adheres to the original with slavish fidelity, except in two places, which betray the mark of a superior hand and, says Professor Elze, "point decisively to Shakespeare." In the *Histoires tragiques* the counsellor who acts the spy during Amleth's interview with his mother, conceals himself under the quilt (*stramentum*, according to Saxo; *loudier* or *lodier*, according to Belleforest), and Amleth on entering the chamber, *jumps* upon this quilt (*santa sur ce lodier*), whereas the English version converts the quilt into a curtain or tapestry, and makes use of the same terms employed by Shakespeare, viz., "hangings" and "arras." In the second place, it is still more striking that the English translator makes Amleth exclaim, in the words of Shakespeare, "A rat! a rat!" *whereof not* a trace is to be found in Belleforest. It is more probable that the translator

adopted an incident and phraseology which had caught the popular fancy and become almost proverbial, than that two such striking passages were invented by a translator of a manifestly inferior stamp and transferred from his work to Shakespeare's, "especially when," as Dr. Furness remarks, "they are the only two points where the phraseology is common to both." He adds, "The above argument of Elze's in favour of the existence of the drama before the translation, has not, I think, met with the acceptance it deserves. To my mind it is convincing."

Dr. Elze places the date of the first *Hamlet* at 1585—1586, and of the translation from Belleforest at 1608.

Shakespeareans refer to this early *Hamlet* as being the work of Thomas Kyd. There does not exist a vestige of a fragment of any evidence to support this assumption. It forms part of the bundle of fiction with which those honourable men endeavour to bolster up the Stratfordian myth.

"IGNOTO."

IN the year 1651 there was published in London a volume in 12mo., entitled "*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*," being a Collection of Lives, Letters, Poems, with Characters of Sundry Personages, "by the curious Pensil of the Ever Memorable Sir Henry Wotton, Kt., Late Provost of Eton Colledg."

Among other things there is an interesting parallel and disparity between the lives of Robert Earl of Essex and George Villiers, Duke of Buckingham, and also a separate Life of the latter. In the parallel and disparity there is much interesting information about the Earl of Essex and his bearing towards the Queen; but for the present the part of the volume to which I desire to draw attention is the end, where some poems, the composition

of Sir Henry Wotton, are introduced, and these are followed by sundry other poems, said to have been "found among the papers of Sir H. Wotton." Of these "sundry poems," five are by Ignoto; one by Dr. B.; one by Chidick Tychborn the night before his execution, and one by Sir Walter Raleigh the night before his death.

The poems by Ignoto are those that claim our attention. The first one is "A Description of the Country's Recreations," and begins :—

"Quivering cares, Heart-tearing fears,
Anxious sighs, Untimely tears
Fly, Fly to Courts,
Fly to fond worldlings sports,
Where strain'd Sardonick smiles are glossing still,
And griefe is forc'd to laugh against her will,
Where mirth's but mummery,
And sorrows only real be."

And there are six more verses to this poem.

The next is "A Dialogue Between God and the Soul," in imitation of Horace.

After this comes another without any title, but commencing :—

"Rise, oh my soul, with thy desires to Heaven
And with divinest contemplation, use
Thy time, where times eternity is given,
And let vain thoughts no more thy thoughts abuse," &c.

Then this is followed by the famous little poem :—

THE WORLD.

"The World's a bubble : and the life of man, less than a span ;
In his conception wretched : from the womb, so to the tomb,
Nurst from his cradle, and brought up to years with cares and
fears.
Who then to frail Mortality shall trust,
But lymns on water, or but writes in dust," &c.

The fifth and last poem is :—

DE MORTE.

"Man's life a Tragedie. His Mother's womb,
(From which he enters) is the tiring room,
This spacious earth the theater," &c.

All these poems are signed "Ignoto," as being by some unknown or hidden person; for as most people, even without a knowledge of Spanish, would know, "Ignoto" means "Unknown." The book, "*Reliquiæ Wottonianæ*," was brought out by Izaak Walton, the famous angler (1593—1683), and both the "Epistle Dedicatorie" and the "Life of Sir Henry Wotton," prefixed to the book, are written by him.

The first edition was, as I have said, in 1651. Second and third editions were brought out in 1654 and 1672. These I have not got, but a fourth edition was brought out in 1685, which is at my hand. This contains a good deal more than was in the first edition, but the "Poems, found among the papers of Sir Henry Wotton," are the same as those of the 1651 edition.

The noteworthy fact, however, is this—that the poem, "The World's a Bubble," instead of being attributed to "Ignoto"—as are the others of the Ignoto series—is plainly set down to "Fra: Lord Bacon." This is very important, for it definitely shows the authorship of these verses, and likewise suggests that "Ignoto," in other places, may also stand for "Fra: Lord Bacon." I certainly believe that the other little poems in this small collection, signed "Ignoto," are also by Bacon.

This *nom de plume*, given to an unknown author, has been curiously persistent throughout the Elizabethan and Jacobean literature.* The name first appears, I

* See "England's Helicon," 1600 and 1614, and re-published by Mr. A. H. Bullen in 1887. This contains a number of poems signed "Ignoto."

think, in Sir John Harrington's Preface to his Translation of "Orlando Furioso," published first in London in 1591 and again in 1607. Here Harrington speaks of that "unknown Godfather, that this last year save one, viz., 1589, set forth a booke, called the Arte of English Poetrie"; and a little further on he alludes to this "unknown Godfather" by the words, "as this same Ignoto termeth all translators."

This, as I say, is the first appearance of "Ignoto," and it is not a little strange that it should be in connection with the authorship of that book, the "Arte of English Poesie," whose authorship has been so much discussed. For it was in this book, as the Rev. Walter Begley points out in his "Nova Resuscitatio" (Vol. I., p. 31), that "we have a translation from the Greek anthology of that very epigram which Bacon also translated freely in his best authenticated poem beginning 'The World's a bubble.'" Begley argues very strongly for Bacon as the author of the "Arte of English Poesie," rather than an old man Puttenham, to whom the learned—on very slight evidence—have attributed the authorship, and I think Begley would have greatly strengthened his argument had he known that Harrington used the very name "Ignoto" for the author of the "Arte," that was afterwards used to conceal the author of "The World's a Bubble," who was subsequently disclosed as Bacon. The connection is very curious, and would certainly seem to be beyond mere coincidence.

The question of the authorship of the "Arte of English Poesie" is one of the most puzzling of the puzzles of Elizabethan literature. The book itself was one of the celebrated treatises on poetry that have been handed down to us from Elizabethan times. Hallam says of it: "In this work we find an approach to the higher province of 'philosophical criticism.'" The book appeared in 1589, and as late as 1607 Sir John

Harrington—who must be accepted as a representative literary man of the period, and in a position to know—was ignorant of the authorship. To him the author was still "Ignoto"; and Camden—the great Camden—was equally ignorant in 1605. I find, too, that Drummond, of Hawthornden, in his notes of a conversation had with Ben Jonson in 1619, speaks of the author of the "Arte" in a way showing that he did not know his name. I quote from the Folio edition of Drummond's Works of 1711, p. 226, in which edition the notes of the conversation with Jonson appear for the first time. What he says is: "He who writeth the Art of English Poesie praiseth much Rawleigh and Dyer; but their works are so few that are come to my hands, I cannot well say anything of them."

The Rev. Walter Begley, in the book above alluded to, has gone carefully into this question, and discusses fully the claim of Puttenham to the authorship; and it is very curious to see the method that was adopted to throw dust in the eyes of the public, and to make them believe that a trustworthy statement had been made disclosing the author. Why false information should have been given may puzzle us to conjecture; but a sufficient reason would be afforded if it were desired to muffle up and hide the real author, as would be the case if he were Bacon.

Begley shows that the evidence most relied on for the authorship was that of the Cornwall antiquary, Richard Carew, of Antony. He was a friend of Camden, and contributed a paper for the second edition of Camden's "Remaines" (1614),* which had not appeared in the first edition (1605). This was twenty-five years after the "Arte of English Poesie" had appeared. In this paper Carew mentions "Maister Puttenham," and he

* See the article "Puttenham" in the "Dictionary of National Biography."

places him between Sir Philip Sidney and Maister Stonihurst as a poet who used the classical metres for English verse better than it had been thought possible so to use them ; and so forthwith Puttenham was accepted as the author of the "Arte," though up to that time (1614) no one had ever heard of him as an author, or thought of him in connection with the "Arte of English Poesie." But the Rev. Walter Begley did not cease his investigations here. By chance he heard that Richard Carew's original MS. was in the British Museum, in the Cottonian collection of manuscripts. On examination of the MS., Begley found that the name of Puttenham does not occur in it at all. It had been interpolated in the printed version, without any authority whatever from the MS. Puttenham has been foisted on the public so as to silence any talk about who the author was, and the public, encouraged by the learned writers upon Elizabethan literature, have, of course, without cavil, accepted him. That Camden should have lent himself to this trick is not a little strange, though possibly he may not have been aware of the interpolation. At any rate, we may charitably suppose this, for in other respects (Begley reports) the MS. is followed word for word, except only in one small instance, where the printed text has "coloured" for "colored."*

This will show how much pains have been taken to keep the author of the "Arte" hidden behind a curtain.

But while Sir John Harrington was writing about this "Ignoto," there was another Ignoto, though not so called, who had something to say on the subject of poets and poetry, and English poets in particular. This was he—the unknown author—who wrote the "Shepherd's Kalendar" (1579).

* See "Nova Resuscitatio," Vol. I., pp. 101—3. Gay and Bird Bedford Street, Strand, London, 1905.

In dealing with any of the complex problems of the Elizabethan literature, one cannot be too careful to keep constantly in mind, and constantly before one, the chief and outstanding facts of the case. One of these main facts in respect of the so-called "Spenser" poems is that the "Shepherd's Kalendar," a most important poem of the Elizabethan age, appeared anonymously in 1579 and was reproduced in four subsequent editions, 1581, 1586, 1591, 1597, all anonymous, though during that time other poems were being freely published under the name of Edmund Spenser. It was not until 13 years after Spenser's death that the "Shepherd's Calendar" was, in 1611, included as a "Spenser" poem in the first collected folio volume of Spenser's works, and even then there was not a word of explanation as to *how* this poem had been identified as one of Spenser's, nor as to *why* it had been brought out so frequently during Spenser's life-time unacknowledged. From 1579 to 1611, a period of thirty-two years, this poem passed in England as the work of an unknown man, and in 1611 it is slipped in among Spenser's works, and the public thus expected to infer that he was the author—certainly a left-handed sort of way of dealing with one of England's greatest poets. One would have thought that the *literati* of England would have devoted some time and attention to the explication of so curious a twist as this. Such, however, is not the case; but Bacon somewhere has said that critics love to "blanch the obscure passages, and discourse upon the plain."

That Spenser was unknown and unacknowledged as the author of the "Shepherd's Calendar" during his life-time, and up to the year 1611, cannot be gainsaid, and contemporary evidence of this condition of want of knowledge is easily produced. I have produced it in my little book, "Bacon's Secret Disclosed," p. 101, but, for the sake of the continuity of the argument, I will show it again here.

In Chapter XXXI., Book I., of the "Arte of English Poesie" (1589), when speaking of the various poets who have arisen in England and their characteristics, the author says :—

"For Eclogue and pastoral Poesie Sir Philip Sydney, and Master Challenner, and that other Gentleman who wrote the late 'Shepherd's Calendar.'"

This clearly shows that the author of the "Arte" was not able to produce the name of the man that wrote the "Shepherd's Calendar," or, what is more likely, was desirous that the public should continue in ignorance of the author's name.

Further, George Whetstones in his "Honourable Life and Valiant Death of Sir Philip Sydney," published in 1587, clearly and plainly attributes the "Shepherd's Calendar" to Sidney, and this though the book professes to be dedicated to Sir Philip himself.

From this it is apparent that the anonymity of the book was thoroughly maintained by the literary men of the time, and the public got no hint as to its authorship from the learned, even if they themselves might have had some secret knowledge.

In "Bacon's Secret Disclosed" I have shown that the personal references to the author of the "Calendar" fit accurately to Bacon, but are quite inapplicable to Spenser.

But now, after this digression to establish and emphasize the fact that the unknown author of the "Shepherd's Calendar" really was unknown, while the various editions of his book were coming out, let me get back to what the unknown author said—or at least to what was said about him—in the "Shepherd's Calendar."

The "Argument" to the October Eclogue is very

significant, and, though I have often glanced through it when reading the "Calendar," I confess that it was only recently that the great importance of its bearing "leapt to the eyes."

The argument is as follows :—

"In Cuddie is set out the perfecte paterne of a Poete, which finding no maintenance of his state and studies, complayneth of the contempt of Poetrie and the causes thereof. Specially having been in all ages, and even amongst the most barbarous, alwayes of singular account and honour, and being indede so worthy and commendable an arte: or rather no arte, but a divine gift and heavenly instinct not to bee gotten by laboure and learning, but adorned with both: and poured into the witte by a certaine *enthusiasmos* and celestiall inspiration, as the author hereof els where at large discourseth in his booke called the English Poete, which booke being lately come to my hands, I mynde also by God's grace upon further advisement to publish."

Here is an interesting development. The unknown editor of the "Calendar," masquerading as "E. K.," is evidently the writer of the above "Argument," for speaking as he does, in a detached way of the author of the "Calendar," it is plainly not the author himself who writes the "Argument."

And further, in the "Gloss" upon the October Eclogue, written by the unknown E. K., the following sentence is found at the end of a long discourse upon the words "For ever":—

"Such honour have Poetes alwayes found in the sight of princes and noble men which this author here very well sheweth, as elsewhere more notably."

I think it is very evident from the foregoing that the unknown editor of the "Calendar" knew that the un-

known author of the same was also the author of another book called the “English Poet,” “which booke being lately come to my (the editor’s) hands, I mynde also by God’s grace upon further advisement to publish.”

What was the book called the “English Poet” that in 1579 he alludes to? I believe it was none other than the “Arte of English Poesie,” published ten years later, in 1589, anonymously.

The first chapter of the first book of the “Arte” is entitled “Poets and Poesie,” and here the author discourses at large upon the inspiration of poets just as described in the above “Argument.” Take the following as a parallel passage to the “Argument.”

“And this science in the perfection, can not grow but by some divine instinct, the Plantonicks call it *furor*;* or by excellencie of nature and complexion: or by great subtiltie of spirits and wit, or by much experience and observation of the world, and course of kinde, or peradventure by all or most part of them. . . . It is therefore of Poets thus to be conceived, that if they be able to devise and make all these things of themselves, without any subject of verity, that they be (by maner of speech) as creating gods. If they do it by instinct divine or natural, then surely much favoured from above.”

I think the very short description in the “Argument,” of what the “English Poete” contains, is sufficient to identify it with the opening chapter of the “Arte,” showing that *that* is the book referred to.

But see what a coil is here!

The unknown author of the “Arte” refers to the unknown author of the “Shepherd’s Calendar,” and the unknown editor of the “Calendar” speaks of its

* Note that *furor* is the Latin equivalent of *enthusiasmos*.

unknown author as the author of the "Arte," who himself has referred to the author of the "Calendar" as being unknown! What a tossing about of these unknowns on a sea of doubt and uncertainty! And how those who really knew who the unknowns were must have laughed over the trick they were playing on the literary world of that age—and of future ages as well!

But amid all this juggling with "unknowns" there was certainly a danger that some shrewd guesses might tread too near "upon the heels of truth"—to borrow Rawley's expression—and so it was prudently arranged to fix the authorship on persons who were dead, and therefore could not be cross-questioned or could not give any disconcerting denials. And thus we have, by a piece of bold "bluff," Spenser credited with the authorship of the "Shepherd's Calendar" in 1611* (even as by similar "bluff" in 1623 the dead Shakespeare got the credit of plays with which he had nothing to do); and in 1614, by a trick, Puttenham* put forward as the author of the "Arte of English Poesie."

My little endeavour here to trace "Ignoto" and to lift the veil from him, has led me from 1685 back to 1579, and throughout that period all this curious juggling with names and personalities has been going on; and all, as I believe, and as, I think, is becoming more and more apparent to those who are willing to see, in order to hide Bacon behind the curtain and prevent his hand from being seen in the great poetic literature of the time.

When one looks at this literature with a seeing eye it is laughable, and almost farcical, to observe the ease with which Bacon and the *αρειωπαλω* (written about in the Harvey-Immerito letter) tricked the learned and the critical from his day down to the present times. They

* Spenser died in 1598, George Puttenham in 1590, and Richard Puttenham in 1601.

had merely to insert in some book a cunningly devised and veiled allusion to some person as being the author of a particular work, and thereupon the learned, having discovered what had been planted for them to find, trumpet forth the results of their labour, and display the fruits of their critical acumen ; and the world is the richer by another literary find. Or the plan may be first to establish the name of some person as a writer ; then fresh works are easily added to his list by the simple expedient of including them among his other works in a new edition, even though the supposed writer has been dead for years, and the critics satisfy themselves that the new works are by the same hand as the old, by discovering the similarity of style and by finding a plum of personal allusion deftly hidden where it may be discovered. And so the play has been carried on. The wits of the critics are not keen enough to enable them to imagine that neither the old works nor the new are by the man whose name has been attached to them, but are altogether by one man who remains hidden in the shadow, unknown, and thrusts some spurious name on the public to do duty as the author.

This trickery in literature is very similar to the modern trick played by the owner of a "bogus" gold mine, when he cunningly "salts" the pseudo mine with pieces of rich gold-bearing quartz ; then an "expert" is sent to examine the mine and make an "independent report." And lo ! the clever man actually finds gold-bearing quartz, *in situ*, and brings specimens to his employers, who, satisfied with the richness of the mine, buy it and laud to the skies the wonderful ability of their "expert."

Thus the critics, once taken in by the cleverness of Bacon and his *αρειωπαλω*, continue year after year, and age after age, to carry on the deception and to pour out praise on those who have in no way deserved it.

I have in a footnote alluded to "England's Helicon." This contains no fewer than twenty-five lyrics signed "Ignoto." Theobald, in his "Shakespeare Studies in Baconian Light" (p. 157), has no hesitation in attributing these, as well as some others, to Bacon under his Shakespeare mantle. He says of the entire book: "I have not the least doubt that this collection was made by Bacon; his royal and antithetic style is unmistakable in the prose dedications and prefaces."

In 1886 Mr. W. H. Burr published in Washington, D.C., a pamphlet showing that the "Ignoto" of the Helicon poems was none other than Bacon." He mentions also that in 1590 "Ignoto" contributed to Spenser's first publication of the "Faery Queen" lines beginning:—

"To look upon a work of rare devise
The which a workman setteth out to view
And not to yield it the deserved prize
That unto such a workmanship is due,
Doth either prove the judgment to be naught
Or else doth show a mind with envy fraught,"

and continues in four stanzas of six lines each.

These "Ignoto" verses do not appear in every copy of the 1590 "Faery Queen," and I am given to understand that copies in which they are present are rare. I have not seen any copy containing them. They are to be found, however, at the end of the "Faery Queen" in the 1611 Folio edition of Spenser's works, and also in the 1617 Folio and in the 1679 Folio, though not at the end of the "Faery Queen."

Another man who has been quoted in support of the Puttenham authorship of the "Arte" is Edmund Bolton, who wrote his "Hypercritica" some time about 1620, though it was not published until 1722. He says that the "Arte" was the work, "as the fame is, of one of the Queen's gentlemen pensioners, Puttenham." His

qualifying remark, "as the fame is," very plainly shows that he was merely repeating the tale cunningly set going by interested people, and fraudulently endorsed by the Carew statement in the way I have shown.

Before leaving this subject — which interests me greatly—and even at the risk of wearying my readers, I must say something about Webbe and his "Discourse of English Poetry" (1586). Webbe is frequently quoted as establishing beyond doubt that Spenser was the author of the "Shepherd's Kalendar." What he says was, I think, a little dust thrown in people's eyes, or one may call it a bit of rich quartz, such as I have described, planted where it might be found. His remarks are * :—

"This place have I purposely reserved for one, who if not only, yet in my judgment principally, deserveth the tittle of the rightest English Poet, that ever I read : that is, the Author of the 'Shepherd's Kalendar,' intituled to the woorthy Gentleman, Master Philip Sidney, whether it was Master Sp, or what rare scholler in Pembroke Hall soever, because himself and his friendes, for what respect I know not, would not reveale it, I force not greatly to set down."

Of course, the critics at once say "Master Sp" means Spenser. If so, it is strange that George Whetstones, a year later (1587), should attribute the poem to Sir Philip Sidney, and knows nothing about Spenser in the matter ; and that later still, in 1589, the Author of "The Arte of English Poesie" is blind to Webbe's hint about "Sp," and speaks of the author of the Kalendar as being unknown. Indeed, not one writer of this period down to 1611 alludes to Spenser as being the author, and not one has followed the lead supposed to

* From Arbor's English Reprints, "A Discourse of English Poetry," by William Webbe, p. 35.

have been given by Webbe, even when poems (the "Fairy Queen" and others) were being freely published under Spenser's name.

A few lines further on in the same part of Webbe's "Discourse" as that from which I have quoted, there is an interesting passage. Webbe is speaking of Master Sp and Gabriel Harvey (Harvey by that time had taken Holy Orders), and we should bear in mind that Spenser, in 1586, had been for some years a clerk in Ireland, a position of great preferment for the poor son of a journeyman tailor. This is what Webbe says:—

"Therefore will I adventure to sette them together, as two of the rarest witts, and learnedst masters of Poetry in England: whose worthy and notable skyl in this faculty, I would wysh, if their high dignities and serious businesses would permit, they would still graunt to be a furtheraunce to that reformed kind of Poetry which Master Harvey did once beginne to ratify."

Note the reference to "high dignities and serious businesses." The latter term would be properly applicable to Gabriel Harvey. But what "high dignity" was there about the clerk, busy at his copying work in distant Ireland? If "Sp" were Spenser, it is difficult to see how his high dignity could be appealed to to permit him to continue his poetic work. But if we use our wits a little we will see that the numerical value of "Sp" is 33, and Bacon also is 33; so if we substitute the value "33" for "Sp" in the equation, and remember for whom that number stands, obscure passages become very plain. Thus when we come to the next allusion to "Sp," at page 52 of Webbe's "Discourse," we may substitute the above value of "Sp" and read:—

"But nowe yet at ye last hathe England hatched

uppe one Poet of this sorte, in my conscience comparable with the best in any respect: even Master 33, author of the 'Shepheardes Kalendar.'

And I venture to think that the reason why other contemporary writers did not follow Webbe in his hint, was that "Sp" and 33 were rather too plain pointers at Bacon, and it was unsafe to give any such clear indication of the authorship, seeing how much of Bacon's secret life is revealed in the Poem, when once a hint of the real authorship is obtained.

It seems to me that a calm consideration of the foregoing should go far to convince even the most hide-bound and most conventional of students that there is something about the literature of this period that is neither disclosed nor understood by the conventional writers on the subject. Why should Spenser—supposing that he wrote it—conceal his authorship of the "Shepherd's Calendar"? Why should the five editions of this book published during his lifetime come out anonymously? And, when the work is given to Spenser in the Folio Edition of his works in 1611, thirteen years after his death, what reason was there for doing it, in an underhand sort of way, without clear and distinct acknowledgment? Surely Spenser, if he were the author, was worthy of better treatment than that. But the treatment of the "Shepherds Calendar" is consistently intelligible, when one understands that it was written by another than Spenser, and merely attributed to him as a "blind."

And so with Puttenham. There were two Puttenhams, Richard and George. George has been generally credited with the authorship, though for the very flimsiest of reasons. And why should his authorship be hidden? Either of them was an old man in 1589—Richard 69 years of age, and George, perhaps, two or three years

older—neither at a likely age at which to have accomplished such a work as the "Arte of English Poesie." George died in 1590 and Richard in 1601. But supposing it were possible that either of these old men could have written, or did write, such a book as the "Arte," what reasonable reason can be given for the authorship being muffled up and hidden for years after the man was dead, and then brought out in the sly and crooked way that I have shown — not declared or plainly stated, but merely hinted at, and left to be guessed by a "clever critic." Surely there was nothing to cast any shame upon the name of Puttenham in plainly announcing him as having been the author of such a remarkable book as the "Arte"—if he were the author—so why make a concealment and secrecy about it? But, again, the play and trick about Puttenham is consistently intelligible when one understands that there was a desire to keep the real author of the "Arte" hidden, and to stop enquirers' questions by giving them some other name to chew upon. And the trick has succeeded "excellently well."

Before concluding, I would like to say a few words about the name "Ignoto." It would be strange, and unlike Bacon, if that word did not contain some hidden and unsuspected meaning. At the outset it struck me as significant that the name should have been borrowed from Spanish or Italian (for the word is the same in either language), and that Latin had not been used, for one would think that Latin would come more naturally rather than Spanish or Italian, especially, too, when Latin was so much in use among the literary men of that time. "Ignotus" would seem to be just as good a name to travel under as "Ignoto," and, being more ordinary, less likely to attract the attention that an "Ignotus" would wish to avoid. But the awkward thing is that the numerical value of "Ignotus" is 100 ;

and 100 = Francis Bacon (Francis 67, Bacon 33); so that to assume the name "Ignotus" to cover Francis Bacon would have been to assume a veil that was a little too transparent. What about "Ignoto"? The numerical value of this is 76, and anyone having discovered that would have been likely to pass on without further consideration. But 76 *reversed* is 67, and 67 is Francis, so that in a secret way "Ignoto" may be said to cover Francis, and thus indicate who is meant. And have we not some warrant for *reversing* whilst trying to trace out Bacon's secret? when we see that in the famous Droeshout portrait of Shakespeare, prefixed to the 1623 Folio, the right arm is *reversed*, and shows us the back instead of the front, though for what reason no man knoweth. But from the above we see how the word "unknown" may be used to make known the Great Unknown.

GRANVILLE C. CUNINGHAM.

JOTTINGS ON LORD BACON.

REFERENCES TO BACON'S DEATH, AND THE DESECRATION OF HIS TOMB.

THE contemporary references we have of Viscount St. Alban's death on April 9th, 1626, are very few, but they are worth looking for, as the fact of his decease in that year has been lately disputed, though no proof of value has been brought forward to show a later date.

The first mention of his death is found in a letter dated April 10th, 1626, from Sir Benjeman Rudyard, at Whitehall, to Sir Francis Nethersole, where, after giving some news, he adds: "Lord St. Albans is dead, and so is Sir Thomas Compton." The reference can be found in "State Papers," Domestic Series, Charles I.

And we also find among the State Papers in 1626, "Minutes of application for an order for £1,000, borrowed by the late Viscount St. Albans from Sir John Wolstenholme in 1616, to be repaid out of the annuity granted to the said Viscount out of the Alienation Office." The chief authority for the date and place of Bacon's death has always been Dr. William Rawley's "Life" of him; but other writers have also alluded to it, though they have not been mentioned by his last biographer, Spedding.

Another proof of Lord St. Alban's death in 1626 comes before us in remembering the Latin verses written by the Cambridge University in admiration of her famous son—the Latin "Manes Verulam," which Spedding printed in full.

It appears that Bacon's will remained unexecuted for fifteen months, when letters of administration were granted July 18th, 1627, to two of his creditors, Sir Robert Rich and Thomas Meautys. The latter had been his secretary for some years, and so great was the love and admiration he had for the master, that after Bacon's death he erected an elaborate monument over his vault in the east end of St. Michael's Church,* probably carried out from his own design, in remembering that Bacon had invented a canopied chair in which he could sit in the open air. So the philosopher is represented seated under an arch, in deep thought.

This is another proof of Bacon's death in 1626.

Lord St. Albans, who had occupied such important positions in Parliament and in the law, seems to have had, probably by his own desire, a private and very quiet burial in St. Michael's Church, St. Albans, Hert-

* In the course of restoration of the church, this monument was moved back half a yard into the wall.

fordshire, which is a little over twenty miles from London. The church is situated about a mile from Bacon's estate of Gorhambury. It is stated that he died during a cold wintry spell, at the home of his friend, the Earl of Arundel, at Highgate, to which he had been hastily taken when he was suddenly seized with illness during a drive, and Bacon's touching letter of apology to the Earl for occupying his house during his absence, is proof enough that he was there at that date. It is now thought that he must have died from acute bronchitis, which was an ailment not thoroughly understood in Bacon's day.

Highgate is a suburb of London, on the route to Gorhambury, and his body was evidently taken direct to his home there, or to the church, and no funeral service was held in London. One reason for a quiet funeral was that Bacon died heavily in debt, leaving no ready money; and further, his wife, Lady Verulam, Countess of St. Albans, had separated herself by her conduct from her husband, and could not be asked to take part in his obsequies. The plague was still raging in the metropolis, scattering people and causing panic, and we can also bear in mind that Bacon had a good many enemies, and had estranged many of his nearest relatives by continual money borrowings.

King Charles I., also, was not so warmly interested in him as his royal father had been; Buckingham was anything but friendly; and Bacon had lately led a retired life from the public eye.

His acknowledged books were only read by the learned, and he knew his philosophical writings were not appreciated, save by a few of his contemporaries.

"For my name and memory I leave it to foreign nations, and "to my own countrymen after some time be passed over."

His prophecy has come true !

To show Bacon's impoverished state, we will quote from a "*History of the reign of Charles I.*," which was written during that monarch's lifetime. The author praises Bacon, and also devotes some space to an account of the desecration of his body in the vault, which fact is but little known. This folio volume* has an engraved pictorial frontispiece, signed G. Faitherness, with a medallion in the middle :

"THE
HISTORY OF
KING CHARLES
BY
H. L. ESQR."

Following this comes the title page :

"Reign of King Charles, an History disposed into annals, the second Edition, revised and somewhat enlarged. Printed by F. L. and J.G. for Hen: Seile, Senior and Junior, over against St. Dunstan's Church in Fleet Street and Edw: Dod, at the Green in Ivy Lane, 1656."

Any student of the original editions of Lord Bacon's works would take this book for a companion volume to Bacon's "*Henry VII.*," though published thirty-two years after that history appeared.

It is a thin folio, printed with exactly the same variety of type that strikes the reader as being so strange in Bacon's History, with the double lines for marginal notes and some of the head-pieces of ornamentation exactly similar.

The author or compiler has concealed his name, and though there is the word "*Finis*" on the last page, the history only takes us to the year 1641, ending with the death of Strafford, which is a very incomplete chronicle of the reign of Charles I., and there is no sign of a

* British Museum (192. 6. 8), 1656.

Vol. II. Yet a second edition was printed in the year following its first appearance, which was seven years after the execution of Charles ; perhaps the description of the king's execution had to be suppressed. But, besides the similarity of large and small type to Bacon's book, the chief interest lies in the mention of his death, and the desecration of his tomb, as follows :—

“In this year 1626 happened the death of Sir Thomas Compton and secondly, the then, and last Lord Chancellor, Sir Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans ; for humane Learning his Ages miracle, but withall the mirrour of human frailty, and as most eminent in intellectual abilities, so too much in his prudential failings, occasioned by his August and Noble soul, which disdaining all drossie and terrene consideration never descended to know the value of money until he wanted it ; and his want was never so great, as when he yielded to the Law of Nature, he left not of his own enough to defray the charge of his Funeral rites. He lyeth interred in the Church of St. Michael at St. Albans in Hertfordshire, and hath there a fair statuary Monument erected for him of white Marble, at the cost of Sir Thomas Meautys, his ancient servant who was not nearer him being then dead, for this Sir Thomas, ending his life about a score of years after,* it was his lot to be inhumed so nigh his Lord's sepulchre that in the forming of his grave, part of the Viscount's body was exposed to view which being spied by a Doctor of Physick, he demanded the head to be given him, and did most shamefully disport himself with that shell which was somewhile the continent of so vast treasure of knowledge.”

This description brings the scene to mind in *Hamlet*, where the latter says, in the gravedigger's scene :

* Sir Thomas Meautys is said to have died in October, 1649.

"Why may not that be the skull of a lawyer? Where be his guddits now, his quiblets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks? Why does he suffer this rude knave now to knock him about the sconce with a dirty shovel, and will not tell him of his action of battery?"

Most likely the "Doctor of Physick" repeated those words with the skull of the author of them in his hands, and the incident is a most extraordinary one, bringing a shudder to those who reverence the great dead. One consoling thought is, how much greater the dead Philosopher and Lawyer still continues to be, than the fool who amused himself with his skull.

This desecration is also mentioned in "Fuller's Worthies," and the name of the doctor is given.* Fuller's notice of Sir Francis Bacon shows a great appreciation of our Philosopher, and a few sentences are worth quoting, as follows:

"Sir Francis Bacon Knight, youngest son of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper was born at York House—anno 1560. He was bred in Trinity College in Cambridge and there first fell into dislike of Aristotle's Philosophy, as barren, and jejune inabling *some* to dispute, *more* to wrangle, *few* to find out truth, and *none* if confining themselves to his principles. By King James he was made Solicitor and afterwards his Attorney, and Lord Chancellor of England.

"His abilities were a clear confutation of two vulgar errors (libells on learned men) First that *Judgment, Wit, Fancy, and Memory*, cannot eminently be in conjunction in the same person; whereas our Knight was a rich Cabinet filled with all four, besides having a golden key to open it,—Elocution.

"He died, anno Domini 1626, in the house of the

* "Fuller's Worthies," British Museum, 2092 f.

Earl of Arundel at Highgate, and was buried in St. Michael's Church in St. Albans; Master Mutes, his grateful servant erecting a Monument for him. Since, I have read that his grave being occasionally (having occasion to be) opened, his scull (the relique of civil veneration) was by one King, a doctor of Physick, made the object of scorn and contempt; but he, who then derided the dead, is since become the laughing stock of the living."

It is to be observed that in these notices of the opening of the tomb, and discovery of Bacon's remains, there is no mention of any manuscripts, or other reliques in the vault.

Who was Dr. King? Was he physician to Sir Thomas and Lady Meautys? It is an interesting speculation as to whether this man, while "disporting himself" with Bacon's remains, had the conviction that he was handling the skull of the author of *Hamlet*, and felt there was a suitable association and a double satire in quoting from the play he had often seen, it, as we think, he *did* quote from the play. In what other way could he "disport himself"?

It is evident that he tried to be humorous on the occasion, whatever were the words he used, and that the spectators were shocked at his levity; as a doctor of physick should have shown more respect on this occasion to the Philosopher whom Sir Thomas Meautys had admired when living, and whose memory he had perpetuated by a handsome monument.

Fuller shows us that retribution overtook the scoffer, and that "Dr. King had since become the laughing-stock of the living." In all probability the skull was restored to its place, and the body wrapped more closely in its leaden sheet; as on the tomb being opened again, a good many years afterwards, the remains were seen still enclosed in lead, and "having the appearance of a body." Had the coffin crumbled to ashes?

Was the body originally placed in a coffin? What state would the vault now be in, should permission ever be granted to examine it?

We have lately seen a picture of Bacon's monument done in water-colours, and very fairly painted (British Museum, MSS. Dept. Illustrations of Hertfordshire, Vol. IV. S.A. Add 32. 351).

It is described as being "done on the spot by Thos. Trotter, 1779," and the letter below it runs as follows:

"Monument of Sr. Francis Bacon in the Church of St. Michael, St. Albans, Herts. 1799."

"The remains of this once illustrious ornament of the British nation, whose universability still extends and illucidites the walks of all civilized society, rests in a vault immediately under the tomb above represented.

"From the information of one of the Parochial Dependents who some years since was present at the opening of it, the venerable Dust was found wrapt up in lead, taking somewhat the form of the Body, perhaps after the manner of the Hungarfords in the Vault in Farley Castle Somersetshire. The marble Figure of the Monument is a most exquisite performance. The same person mentioned above also added that many years back there was an abortive attempt made by some Foreigners to carry off the Figure (marble figure) in the night, but on their removing it, they probably found it too weighty a matter for concealment. It was taken from its site, and left in the Chancel un-mutilated."

We learn from the above that Bacon's tomb and monument have gone through several vissicitudes.

A. C. BUNTEN.

NUMBER 287.

"‘Prove it,’ says I. ‘His acts prove it,’ says he. ‘Prove them,’ says I. ‘And he could not prove them,’ said the red-faced man, looking round triumphantly."—*Sketches by Boz.*

CHARLES DICKENS, who most people know was the author of the sketches, wrote to a friend in 1880, "The life of Shakespeare is a fine mystery, and I tremble every day lest something should turn up."

Something turns up now almost daily.

Those who sniff at cyphers, and seek to ignore or belittle the toilers upon those used by Francis Bacon and his secret fraternity, have much in common with the red-faced man.

Francis Bacon, Viscount St. Albans, sought fame, as a reputation to come to a man after death, rather than to accompany him during life.

He desired the considered, unemotional verdict of future ages.

His cyphers seem to have constituted separate cords, only to be grasped after hard inductive labour, whereby the labyrinth of his extensive schemes for the betterment and relief of man's estate might be reached and proved, and posterity's pronouncement obtained.

Whether the triumphant-looking red-faced man of our generation wants proof, or even understands it, matters very little. A later generation will.

That there were several cypher cords may have been disappointing to individual decipherers; yet the combination obtains the strength and value of a cable. The two pillars at the porchway of King Solomon's Temple are said in Freemasonry to be respectively called Boaz (meaning "strength") and Jachin (meaning "to estab-

lish")—conjointly "stability." Perhaps the joint effect of the cyphers may thus be symbolized.

Amongst the cyphers noted by Bacon in his "De Augmentis" was a Kay cypher which, to the extent to which we seem to have mastered its solution, we will refer to later, as it has a little to do with the subject of this paper on the number 287.

It may probably form a key or introductory link in Bacon's chain of evidence.

Mr. E. V. Tanner, whose wonderful researches will we hope soon appear in print, was the first to call attention to this number 287, which he found to be the count of the letters in the Address to the Reader prefixed to the Shakespeare First Folio.

Some tests made with this key number 287 we subjoin in the hope that others will make tests with this number.

Sir E. Durning-Lawrence has already noted that 287 is the numerical equivalent (by time cypher) of the long word in "Love's Labour Lost," which word is said to be the 151st on page 136.

287 is the count of the words (excluding italic words) which in the column of "King John, Act I., Scene i., in the First Folio, precede the words:

"My dear Sir,
"Thus leaning on mine elbow I begin."

Dr. Owen states that the above words begin Francis Bacon's instructions to the decipherer of his word cypher. There is every probability of the accuracy of this statement. One would almost think that Bacon intended the decipherer to be taken to this passage by count, because the last five of the 287 words reads, "My picked man of Count[ies]."

287 is the count of the letters and figures on the Latin inscription upon the statue of Bacon in St. Michael's

Church, Gorhambury, St. Albans, as rendered on page 258 of Tenison's "Baconiana," 1679.

287 A.D. is given in Preston's "History of Freemasonry" as the "date when St. Alban" was the first Grand Master.

287 in Kay cypher is the numerical equivalent of "Fra. Rosicrosse."

This last word is spelt as Dr. John Wilkins spelt it, a few years after Bacon's death, in "Mathematical Magick." We quote from page 136 of the fifth edition, where Wilkins refers to the sepulchre of *Francis Rosicrosse*. Dr. Wilkins was a member of the Invisible College, and a founder of the Royal Society, one of Bacon's projects. The name Francis does not appear in the "Confessio Fraternitatis," but as Bacon seems to have been the founder and first head of the English fraternity of the Rosy Cross, one can hardly regard this as a "slip" of the pen, more particularly as, omitting italic words until you come to Francis Rossicrosse, the latter is the 151st word on page 136 = 287. In the Translator's Address to the Readers in the 1612 Bible a count of 287 words brings you to three lines beginning thus:—

b		eing
a		re
con		science

Mr. W. E. Clifton, who joins in this article, inferred the Kay cypher to be so styled because K is the tenth letter of the Elizabethan alphabet, and its equivalent consists of two figures, 10. The letter L is number 11, and so on to the letter Z, which is 24.

To have represented A by 25 was to have taken risk of early discovery, as the letter A is often repeated. Mr. Clifton found a clue in a small book in his possession, published by Thomas Powell, a contem-

porary and admirer of Francis Bacon. In this, the next symbol to Z is & = 25, then a small letter e as 26 (probably both of them nulls). The letter A is thus made number 27, and the regular E is 31. B is, of course, 28.

At the end of Rawley's "Life of Bacon," in "Resuscitatio," 1671 (3rd edition), on page 17, is a notice to the reader, carefully covered with paper. It draws the reader's attention to the outward fact that a letter to Doctor A commeth in the 27th folio.

In this same "Resuscitatio," in the "Charge to the Verge," on page 27, line 27, after the 33rd word, is a strange punctuation mark, the type for which must have been specially cut. It consists of a large comma with a small comma immediately above it. Then follow the words, "Watchful, not asleep." One could almost suspect that the "Charge to the Verge" masks an address to Rosicrosse initiates. The brotherhood were said never to hold any meetings. An initiate would know only the man by whom he was verbally initiated. If all other communications were made acroamatically through signs and cyphers in printed books, the risk of exposure and the danger of denunciation would be very limited.

In the first table of letters in Gustavo Seleno's "Cryptographiae," 1624, thirty-three letters each way form a square. In this square A is the 27th letter, counting from either side, and is the only letter in the table which counts the same both ways.

There are many odd things both in this 3rd Edition of the "Resuscitatio" and in "Baconiana," 1679. Refer in the latter to pages 4, 5, and 79 of the Introduction, and page 33 of the "Remains." The Introduction was written by Tenison, afterwards Archbishop of Canterbury.

Why should this prominent clergyman have written

such rubbish about the great philosopher, Bacon, as the following on page 89 :

He "set it down from his observation that the Bolt of the Rustic often hits the mark ; and that the Sow in rooting may describe the letter A, though she cannot write an entire tradegy." We notice that commencing with the sentence at top of the page, 27 words (including words in italics) precede the words, "may describe the letter A."

The last page of the "Remains," forming part of the 1679 "Baconiana," is number 259.

259 is the Kay cypher equivalent of Shakespeare :

S = 18

H = 34

A = 27

K = 10

E = 31

S = 18

P = 15

E = 31

A = 27

R = 17

E = 31

—

259

The first words on the page are "That is Francis Bacon." By such merry devices did the Rosy Cross brethren instruct and amuse one another beneath the unsuspecting gaze of "Inferiour Readers."

PARKER WOODWARD.

WM. E. CLIFTON.